

May 14, 1975

and I don't think it will arise in the coming fiscal year, that the Core of Engineers does get a go-ahead from Washington, that there would be enough money to go ahead and further develop site 20. We have never objected to site 20, we have never objected to Sarpy County if they want to develop site 20, and also site 19 and site 21. There have never been any objections to that. We will never raise any objections. Again, we need a better flood control project, the reevaluation is underway, it will take a year until it comes back from Washington, and in the mean time, we don't have to appropriate any money in our budget for something that at the moment doesn't even exist.

PRESIDENT: Your time is up. Senator Dickinson.

SENATOR DICKINSON: Well, Mr. President, I know time is of the essence, and I apologize for taking any more, but I think this is important. I just want to respond briefly to a few statements that have been made. Senator Syas and Senator Keyes, I hope we will have the attention of the whole body, and particularly those people who are interested in this. Senator Keyes quoted some figures as to the cost of land at site 20. He was too low. The average cost of land acquisition on site 20 was \$4,700 per acre. The farmers did not get it. The information as to where these sites around the perimeter of Omaha were going to be has been made available a long time ago to those people who were aggressive enough and become vitally interested in it. Ninety percent of the land in this site is owned by speculators, they're the ones that got the \$4,700 a acre, not farmers. These lands that are bought at other sites, the land which was bought at Irvington, which is a suburban area was about \$1,400 an acre. Most of this did go to farmers. Some way or another they don't get the high price figures. This project will take a total of about \$14 million worth of land, assessed evaluation off the tax rolls. Now, yesterday, and it appears we're going to pass LB 344, which means we exempt, technical community colleges from property taxes. We're taking \$10 to \$14 million right off the tax base to support this technical community college. What does that do? That raises the cost of that taxable property remaining. It even takes a greater block of land out of local school districts in which these farms lie. One district in particular is affected greatly by the lack of evaluation. I would point out to you that land is the greatest tax producer that this nation has and requires least services from government. It doesn't require any services at all for the taxes it pays. If you start building houses on lots, that's the kind of property that may, possibly, according to Senator Syas, with whom I don't agree, but if they're right this evaluation may be replaced in these taxing entities with development. When you get development, they are are a liability as far as supporting schools, churches, which of course isn't a tax situation. But other entities of government require taxes. You cannot replace tax producing land. How long can we as a nation, and we as a state, and individual entities of government continue to take tax producing properties and turn them around, not only take them off the tax rolls, and make them into tax consumers, into large tax consumers, and this is what that land would then be. Instead of a producer, it would then be a consumer. I don't think we can continue this. Senator Syas, is he in this room? I just wanted you to listen, George, this would not stop all the dams